

Opinion No. 22-3574

August 31, 1922

BY: HARRY S. BOWMAN, Attorney General

TO: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D. C. Attention
Mr. Charles E. Baldwin

**Application Workmen's Compensation Law to Temporary Employes and
Employes Whose Duties Require Their Temporary Absence From the State.**

OPINION

{*176} In reply to your letter of the 15th instant, asking for information concerning the construction placed upon the Workmen's Compensation law of New Mexico, governing an employe under a resident employer whose duties may call him outside of the boundaries of the state, and also asking whether a difference is made between cases of temporary and incidental employment and employment of more continued periods, I beg to advise:

In answer to your first inquiry I would state that in my opinion the Workmen's compensation law would be effective in such cases if the duties of the employe which called him out of the state were within the scope of his employment during the period that he might have been employed within the state.

In answer to your second inquiry I would advise that in my opinion, there is no difference between cases of temporary and incidental employment and permanent employment.

Neither of these questions have ever been passed upon by our court, nor have I been called upon heretofore to consider these questions.